

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-8, 11-18, 22-29, and 34-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calder et al. (US 2001/0042140), hereinafter “Calder” in view of Friedman et al. (U.S. 6,167,455, hereinafter “Friedman”. Claims 9, 10, and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calder in view of Friedman and further in view of Matsutsuka (U.S. 2002/0026447), hereinafter “Matsutsuka”. Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calder in view of Friedman and further in view of Weber et al. (US 6,889,180), hereinafter “Weber”. Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calder in view of Friedman and further view of Nickles (US 5,974,569), hereinafter “Nickles”. Claims 7, 25, 36 and 37 have been cancelled. Claims 1-6, 8-24 , 26-35 and 38 remain in prosecution. No new matter has been introduced via this amendment.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-8, 11-18, 22-29, and 34-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calder in view of Friedman. Claims 9, 10, and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calder in view of Friedman and further in view of Matsutsuka. Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calder in view of Friedman and further view of Weber. Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calder in view of Friedman and further view of Nickles.

Although the cited Friedman reference was mentioned as teaching in col. 7, lines 48-61 “*binds an object representing the target to an underlying model object of an underlying application logic representing a collection of underlying state by a source object and a query path*” as recited in claim 1, Applicants cannot find any discussion of using a source object and query path in Friedman as recited in claim 1. Friedman in col. 7, lines 48-61 and elsewhere fails to teach the above noted limitation of binding an object representing the target to an underlying model object of an underlying application logic representing a collection of underlying state by a source object and a query path. The use of a source object and query path reduces the complexity level and the need for technical expertise in command binding

**DOCKET NO.:** 307339.01 / MSFT-3490  
**Application No.:** 10/822,910  
**Office Action Dated:** January 9, 2008

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

and routing. Col. 7, lines 48-61 in Friedman is discussing a drag and drop operation between two contexts which is different than that which is recited in claim 1. Applicant agrees with the comment on page 3 of the office action stating that the Calder reference “does not explicitly disclose a collection of underlying state is represented by the application logic.”

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite in part:

***“stateless commands are realized by providing a model method on a model and binding to the model method instead of a command object”***. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph [0043] of the specification. The cited Calder reference directed to a method and apparatus for discovering and activating software components and the cited Friedman reference directed to a method and system for synchronous operation of linked command objects taken individually or in combination fail to teach or suggest realizing stateless commands as recited in claim 1. In view of the above, independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-17 which add further nonobvious features to claim 1 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Independent method claim 18 has been amended in a similar fashion to claim 1 and given the above comments, independent claim 18 and dependent claims 19-24 and 26-34 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Independent claim 35 has been amended in similar fashion to claim 18 and the further limitations of claims 36 and 37 have been further introduced therein. As amended claim 35 and dependent claim 38 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

**DOCKET NO.:** 307339.01 / MSFT-3490  
**Application No.:** 10/822,910  
**Office Action Dated:** January 9, 2008

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: April 9, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman  
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439